DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 276 SP 040 601

AUTHOR Fishbein, Susan; Osterman, Karen
TITLE Crossing Over: Learning the Roles and Rules of the Teacher-Administrator Relationship.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; *Interpersonal Relationship; Socialization; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of the administrator education internship in perpetuating the gap in relationships between teachers and administrators. It explored the moral socialization that teachers in pre-service administrative preparation programs experienced while engaged in administrative internships, examining the messages that administrative interns received which perpetuated the gap. Nine diverse female administrative candidates provided data via written questionnaires, journals, pre- and post-internship interviews, and audiotaped internship seminar sessions. Using these data, information was gathered on anticipatory and pre-service socialization before, during, and after completing the three-semester internship. Data analysis indicated that during the internship, prospective administrators received powerful messages from teachers and administrators about the nature of their organizational role and the organizational rules governing the role behavior. The messages informed interns that administrators were expected to exercise control and rely on traditional bureaucratic strategies to do so. The use of these strategies was deemed necessary because teachers were subordinates, and thus passive, apathetic, and resistant to authority. Neither group trusted the other, communication was guarded, and they assumed that their relationship was adversarial and acted accordingly. Teacher-administrator relationships were defined along two dimensions (organizational relationships and personal relationships). (Contains 49 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 276

Crossing Over: Learning the Roles and Rules of the Teacher-Administrator Relationship

Susan Fishbein and Karen Osterman

April 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susan Fishbein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

SP040601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Crossing Over: Learning the Roles and Rules of the Teacher-Administrator Relationship

Susan Fishbein
Karen Osterman
Hofstra University

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA
April 2001

With current reforms calling for shared decision making among the various constituencies of school communities (parents, students, community members, school educators), many presume that teachers and administrators are already working collegially and collaboratively within schools. Both research and anecdote, however, document the presence of a deep rift between these two groups. Given the separation and conflict between teachers and administrators, some teachers nevertheless "cross over" and learn to become administrators.

The teachers who do "cross over" into administration undergo an extensive socialization process, normally including formal education in a university setting. Over the last decade and a half, college and university programs preparing school leaders have sought to improve the process by including internship field experiences, ostensibly to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Consistent with current theory, formal preparation programs in educational administration promote teacher-administrator collaboration and communication. Despite these efforts, many administrators adopt traditional behavioral patterns as they assume their new roles; and the gap continues. The purpose of this study was to determine the role that the internship plays in perpetuating this gap between teachers and administrators.

Literature Review

Teacher Administrator Relationships: The Chasm

Threading the fabric of the history of the relationship between teachers and administrators are structural, cultural, symbolical, and political differences that establish clear lines of demarcation and situate the two camps oppositionally. Through the school management business model that developed around the turn of the 20th century, which reinforced the "clear sense of 'them and us', of management and line, of employer and employee" (Ball, 1987, p. 134), distinct professions of administration and teaching emerged (Marshall, 1991). Placed in vertically separate locations in the hierarchy, teachers are situated firmly in the trenches of the operating core in the classroom, while administrators, ensconced in their offices, are removed from the core technology of the school. Assigned different tasks, teachers have been expected to teach, and administrators to

administer. As Marshall (1991) pointed out, "[s]pecial training and certification for administrators were developed, formalizing the separateness of administrators. . . . [F]ormal and informal job descriptions and selection processes cemented the distinction between the work and the culture of teachers and school administration" (p. 140).

Given these structural differences in roles within the organization, it is not surprising to find evidence of different cultural perspectives between teachers and administrators. Hargreaves (1990) found that teachers and administrators have different conceptions of time, and that this causes conflict. Blase & Kirby (1992) emphasized that there are "[m]any physical and psychological barriers [that] make interaction and communication between administrators and teachers difficult" (p. xvi). As Marshall (1991) summarized, "[t]eachers and administrators see the world differently, having different perceptions of the same event, issue, or program" (p. 140).

The symbolic stances of teaching and administration provide another lens to sharpen the distinction. The "gendering" of the two occupational roles, that is, teaching as female, administration as male, suggests why it is so difficult to reconcile the opposites in the "hermaphroditic" role of the department chair, where the two sides converge (Siskin, 1995). Surely legendary images of principals as "charismatic bullies," "ship captains," "tall [men] in the saddle," and "knights in shining armor" provide graphic illustrations of the masculine gendering of administration (Meier, 1995, pp. 127-128). The fact that "80 percent of all elementary school principals are men and 90 percent of teachers are women" reinforced for Meier "the 'women and children over here' syndrome" (p. 126).

Descriptions of "stiff, besuited administrators" (Kammeraad-Campbell, 1991, p. 30) or "the impersonal, neutral, bureaucratic administrator" (Larson, 1992, p. 10) are chilling images that depict principals in an unflattering light and encourage teachers to view administrators with disdain and ambivalence (Kammeraad-Campbell, 1991).

Therefore, whether teaching and administration are gendered, oxymoronic, or stereotyped, the collective imagery suggests a good deal of antithesis. These contrasts come to life in the micropolitical arena of the school, where such struggles are played out. In the jockeying for power in the organization, administrators and teachers, whether knowingly or not, exercise control. Anderson (1991) pointed out that even principals who are open and facilitative exercise some form of control over their teachers through "cognitive politics" (p. 120) and through "meaning management" (p. 122). According to Ball (1987), the "micropolitical conundrum" (p. 82) of the school organization centers on the issue of control. "The head must achieve and maintain control

(the problem of domination), while encouraging and ensuring social order and commitment (the problem of integration)" (p. 82).

Likewise, teachers exercise control, impacting administrative control or reacting to such control. As Gronn (1988) noted, "[t]eachers often carry their classroom superordinancy over into their relationships with their administrative superiors. . . . [A]s a consequence, teachers who become administrators have to adjust to having teachers attempt to control them" (p. 309). McNeil (1988) also found that teachers exercise classroom control of students through knowledge control (what is taught and not taught and how knowledge is transmitted) in response to administrative control (the ways in which administrators exert influence over teachers). Even through an unobtrusive form of control – informal socialization – teachers (as well as the larger school community) influence what new principals do (Hart, 1991).

Administrative Socialization

In the socialization literature there are various ways that the concept is defined and used. The broadest view of socialization includes acquisition of skills and norms and recognizes that socialization is formal as well as informal (Begley & Campbell-Evans 1992; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994; Mintzberg,1993; Weidman & Stein,1990).

Greenfield (1985) summarized the definitions of socialization, and organizational socialization in particular. He broadly defined socialization as "the process through which one acquires the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to adequately perform a social role." More specifically, "organizational socialization refers to the process by which one is taught and learns 'the ropes' of a particular organizational role," including the ways in which one develops "the attitudes, perspectives, and behaviors needed to work satisfactorily within organizational settings." Greenfield subdivided organizational socialization into "moral socialization objectives and technical socialization objectives," finding the former to be "concerned with the acquisition and internalization of group norms, values, and attitudes," while the latter to be "concerned with the acquisition and appropriate use of knowledge, skills, and associated techniques needed to adequately perform in a particular role or position" (Greenfield, 1985, p. 2).

The process by which teachers learn to become administrators is a lengthy one that can begin well before the person begins formal preparation to assume the role and includes formal and informal dimensions. Whether as students in school, members of the community, or as educators employed in schools, we learn about teachers and administrators from watching them in action and interacting with them (Greenfield, 1975, 1985). In this anticipatory phase, candidates learn about

the role through observation, cues, and feedback; they also make decisions about their own aspirations to the role phase (Valverde, 1974). Based on their preconceptions about the role (Begley & Campbell-Evans,1992) and "the subjective warrant" (Dewar, 1989; Lawson, 1983; Lortie, 1975) – that is, the way candidates test themselves against their conception and requirements of the anticipated role – potential candidates either weed themselves out or remove the obstacles, or "subjective filters" (Lortie, 1975, p. 39), that would prevent them from considering the role.

Once an individual makes a decision to seek the role, socialization becomes more direct and incorporates formal as well as informal dimensions. Formal preservice socialization occurs as part of administrative course work and internship training. The informal continues to occur through unplanned experiences and exposure to administration while the educator straddles the two roles, usually retaining the original role as teacher and also working as an intern and student of educational administration (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994). The socialization process continues as the once prospective administrators fully cross over into the ranks of practicing administrators.

At every stage of the process, even when planned, administrative socialization occurs in unintentional ways and produces unintentional outcomes (Briggs-Carter, 1991; Crow & Glascock, 1995; Marshall, 1991, 1992; Marshall & Mitchell, 1990), at times producing candidates with authoritarian visions. Because the direct human influence of mentors (formal socialization agents) and sponsors (informal socialization agents) can be so potent (Edson, 1987; Muse, Thomas & Wasden, 1992; Valverde, 1974), it is not surprising to find that new administrative candidates emerge as replicas of their predecessors.

Research suggests that the administrative internship plays a particularly powerful and significant role in the socialization process. Studies of administrative socialization describe the transition from teacher to administrator as one involving deep psychological transformations (Cordiero & Smith-Sloan, 1995; Restine, 1990). According to White & Crow (1993), the internship is "the crux or key rite of passage" that involves "a paradigm shift that is personal, professional, and philosophical" (p. 12).

An important element in this paradigm shift involves a separation from the previous role of teacher. Crow & Pounders (1996) found that that interns "experience a tension between the occupational culture of administration and that of teaching"; the interns become involved in a "cultural struggle to define their role, their values, and their beliefs" with one culture "introducing

them to a new occupation with new privileges, responsibilities, norms, and allegiances [and] another pulling at their previous allegiances, norms, and values" (pp. 24-25). This separation from the teacher role is not only profound but, as White and Crow (1993) explain, "may be dysfunctional for developing transformational leaders who emphasize instruction" (p. 32).

Purpose of the Study

Significant differences between the two professional roles of teaching and administration thread the fabric of the history of the relationship between teachers and administrators. Whether structurally, culturally, symbolically, or politically, clear lines of demarcation situate the two camps oppositionally. Given the separation and conflict between teachers and administrators, some teachers nevertheless learn to become administrators. Through informal and formal preservice and inservice experiences, which are varied, susceptible to myriad influences, and laced with the elements embodied in the separation and conflict, teachers engage in the cultural struggle to redefine their role, belief, and values, and adopt attitudes and behaviors. They develop an identity that characterizes them as administrators, separating them from their former teacher peers and dividing them from their former teacher selves. They cross over the chasm.

Although we know that the internship is an important part of the socialization process, yet we still know very little about what actually happens in administrative internships as teachers get the chance to try on new apparel and experiment with new gear. Is the canyon between teaching and teachers, and administration and administrators, etched and shaped there?

The purpose of this study was to explore the moral socialization (Greenfield, 1985) that teachers in preservice administrative preparation programs experience while engaged in administrative internships. Greenfield (1985) defined *moral socialization* as "the acquisition and internalization of group norms, values, and attitudes" (p. 2). Juxtaposed against teachers' prior moral socialization about administrators and administration, as they themselves learn to become administrators, what norms or "assumptive worlds" (Marshall & Mitchell, 1990) confront teachers at the cusp of role change from teacher to administrator and at the juncture of the cultures of teaching and administration? The specific interest was in the norms or "assumptive worlds" that inform or govern the relationship between teachers and administrators. Specifically, as part of their moral socialization, what messages do administrative interns receive that perpetuate the gap in the relationship between teachers and administrators?

Methodology

Participating in the study from the spring of 1997 to the summer of 1998 were nine administrative candidates enrolled in a preservice educational administration preparation program at a regional university. Out of 26 students in the cohort, nine prospective informants agreed to participate. The volunteers, though all female, exhibited diversity in age, years in teaching, ethnic identification, subjects taught, and experience in a wide variety of public and private schools.

At the beginning of the study, the participants had been in the field of education as few as three years (one participant) and as many as 20 years (two participants), with an average of nine years. Four participants were in their 20's; three, in their 30's; and two, in their 40's. Responses to ethnic identification were "African-American" (three); "Caucasian" (one); "Italian" (one); "Jewish" (three); "White" (one). Three of the nine participants reported a career prior to teaching. Eight of the nine participants taught on the elementary level, but represented different grade levels and specialties. The ninth taught at the middle school level.

In this preparation program, the internships parallel the course work in the final three semesters of the program (summer, fall, and spring). Typically, these internships involve a minimum of 200 hours in each of three different settings, including building and central office experience. The university also recommends that the interns complete the summer internship in a full-time capacity in a district other than their own. Prior to and during the placement, the University supervisor meets with the intern and cooperating supervisor to insure that the placement will provide appropriate experience; and every effort is made to ensure that the quality of the experience will be a positive one.

The participants in the study did, in fact, experience a variety of internship placements, and this contextual diversity contributed to the richness of the data. All of the interns completed internships at the building level in their own districts, and four also did internships at the building level outside of their home district or changed jobs during the course of their field placements. At the building level, the majority worked with the principal as the cooperating administrator; more than half worked with two different principals during their different placements. Seven of the nine participants completed central office internships – three with their district superintendent, and four with assistant superintendents in districts other than their home district. Two interns experienced placements in private schools; the majority worked in suburban public school districts. In sum, the nine interns completed over 200 hours in each of 23 different placements. As far as the demographics of the various school districts and settings, none of the placements occurred in low-socioeconomic districts; all were in districts that were solidly middle class or considered to be more

affluent, upper middle class. These were all school districts whose student achievement scores were above the State reference point on standardized tests, and in some instances, scores were at the high end of the achievement continuum.

Through written questionnaires and journal documents, semi-structured audio-taped pre- and post-internship individual interviews, and audio-taped internship seminar sessions, the researcher gathered data about anticipatory and pre-service socialization before, during, and following completion of the three-semester internship assignments. In the first phase of the data collection, the primary researcher gathered demographic and baseline information regarding each participant's anticipatory socialization, including information about their experience in the field of education, reasons for engaging in administrative preparation, career aspirations, and assumptions about teacher and administrator roles and relationships. Participants also completed a short questionnaire providing demographic information and brief responses to these general questions. Follow-up individual semi-structured interviews – audio-taped in person – conducted prior to the interns' field experience greatly extended and deepened the questionnaire data.

The next phase of the socialization process, the internship, constituted the main portion of the data collection. This stage in data collection included the gathering of a variety of qualitative data, including interview notes and transcriptions from the internship seminars, reflective journals (which were also a course requirement for the interns), and other documents (i.e., memos obtained by the interns during their internships from their field sites). The university program's internship meetings, conducted three times each semester for approximately two hours per session, generated the majority of the data. Since four of the nine participants began their internships one semester early, the primary researcher attended their sessions a semester prior to the entire participants' sessions. At all these sessions, she took the role of participant-observer; although she took notes, she relied heavily on audio-taping and transcribing each of the sessions, which enabled her to participate and concentrate during each session. The content of these sessions generated the topics and themes that were explored in the individual interviews once the internships were completed. The researcher attended all internship meetings each semester, noting what the interns discussed regarding the content of their field experiences as they engaged in reflective practice about administrative socialization. The internship faculty, working in tandem as co-researchers, supported a focus on the research topic and questions during the internship seminars. The participants themselves were also co-researchers, gathering data about the problem of a perceived teacher-administrator gap.

The internship meetings included only participants in the research study during the first two semesters. The faculty field supervisor and researcher focused the discussions toward the research question but did not preclude other discussions relevant to the interns' concerns. Where appropriate, the discussions about the research question were extended through probes and topical questions. In the third semester, the seminar groups included participants and non-participants. For this semester, the researcher attended sessions but held separate meetings with the interns to discuss the research question.

Data collection concluded at the end of the third semester for the participants in the form of individual semi-structured exit interviews (audio-taped in person). Each interview provided an opportunity for each informant's own debriefing and reflection on the internship and research informant experience. Only one participant had not completed the last portion of her internship field experience over the period of time during which the other the exit interviews were performed. Therefore, the exit interview data are drawn from eight, rather than nine, participants.

The participants' exposure to the same educational administration preparation program not only helped to frame the data collection but also provided a theoretical backdrop against which the practical field experiences were juxtaposed. The preparation program's mission describes the kind of educational leaders that the program seeks to nurture: "humane and ethical social critics" and "creative, flexible, visionary leaders" who can "appreciate, construct, interpret, and integrate knowledge for the purpose of social transformation in a democratic society." The program is designed to "develop educational leaders and change agents who will accept roles as reflective and effective scholar-practitioners." In addition to the field experiences and seminars that the three semesters of the administrative internship provide, the coursework includes the study of individuals in organizations; schools as social organizations; the social, political, economic, and legal contexts of schools; framing problems and making decisions; and educational program development, delivery, and assessment. The program provides a range of learning activities, environments and sources, including individual and whole- and small-group projects; role plays; simulations; visitations by partnership district administrators and guest speakers; behavioral modeling by instructors; coursework readings; and feedback from instructors and colleagues. According to the department mission statement, the program seeks to develop scholar-practitioners who

> understand organizations, work effectively with people in diverse, multicultural environments, and respond to the transformative possibilities of educational practice. Our graduates are expected to engage in a

> reflective practice that can successfully confront race, gender, and equity issues from historical, legal, and philosophical perspectives. We are committed to preparing educational leaders who not only can imagine an alternative educational world, but who can enact it.

Data analysis was "a continuous, iterative enterprise" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 12), consistent with the assumptions of qualitative methodology. The researcher personally transcribed all audiotaped data not only to ensure accuracy but to deepen and enrich the data analysis. In addition to coding, clustering, and memoing, traditional methods of data reduction and display (cutting and pasting; matrices, charts, and diagrams), as well as non-traditional methods (QSR NUD*IST 4.0, Scolari), supported the data analysis. Once the researcher began analysis in writing preliminary dissertation drafts, she was able to share with the participants – via email and telephone – preliminary data analyses in order to prompt "respondent validation" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 195), which contributed to the rest of the data organization and analysis, including verification. Follow-up discussions with the participants and the faculty in person, on the telephone, and via email provided opportunities for conclusion drawing and member checking.

Analysis

During the internship, the prospective administrators received powerful messages from teachers as well as administrators about the nature of their organizational roles and the organizational rules governing the role behavior. Teachers and administrators were consistent in their understanding of these unwritten and deeply embedded roles and rules and conveyed them explicitly and implicitly.

Teacher-administrator relationships were defined along two dimensions. Along one dimension, there were organizational relationships. Teachers and administrators defined themselves according to their assumptions about their organizational roles. Enacting these roles, rules followed. Making the assumptions that "administrators are the bosses; they have power" and "teachers are subordinates; they are powerless," administrators used power to avoid conflict and to achieve compliance, and teachers resorted to manipulation or passive resistance.

Along another dimension, there were personal relationships. However, teachers and administrators carved out their personal relationships with one another according to their assumptions about their organizational roles. The personal relationships reinforced the organizational relationships. Making the assumption that neither side trusts the other, each side generally maintained distance and protected self by withholding information and feelings.

Organizational Relationships

Assumption: Administrators Have the Power

Teachers and administrators both strongly conveyed the message and underlying assumption that "administrators have the power." Teachers reminded interns that they (the interns) were perceived as "bosses" and in control, and administrators reinforced the same normative expectation to the interns.

Teachers perceived interns had risen to the level of "boss," and in that perception there was an unspoken "administrators have the power" message. One intern, who was also the principal's "teacher-in-charge" when he was absent, interpreted her colleagues' reactions to her on a particular day of the principal's absence as "She's stepping into the role of principal." Some of her closer friends "kidded around" and "called [her] boss." When she received instructions to go ahead without the principal with a staff meeting he had planned, she recalled, "No wonder why people were saying, 'Look at this one, she thinks she's taking right over!'" Another intern repeated the teachers' words to her: "Who are you comin' in here thinkin' that you're gonna be some administrator – what are you gonna be, my BOSS now?"

Administrators, too, conveyed to candidates that "administrators have the power." The interns learned from administrators that those administrators who were hired were those who evidenced the ability to control teachers; they might even be the "cronies" of current in-house administrators. In one example, the intern heard central office administrators voice concern over an assistant principal: "If he were to become principal, would he be able to let go of those teachers who he was so pal-ly, pal-ly with when he was a teacher? Can he be principal of this school and still keep the teachers' respect?" Others noted a superintendent who had "already brought his old cronies in" or a new director who "got [the] position because of connections." The interns also observed administrators who defined the "power game" for prospective or new administrators – in a kind of *rite of passage*, administrators were "invited in" to the club or not based upon gender (male over female) or if they were perceived to have passed muster. Some interns were "lured" into administrative positions once they had impressed others that they had "crossed over." Another intern was stopped cold by her building principal when he refused to become her cooperating administrator.

Strategy: Use the Power

Administrators conveyed the message to interns that they were expected to control teachers. Strategies for control might include the exercise of their unilateral power to "flex

muscles," "create stress," or enact "quid pro quo" to achieve compliance. Other strategies included "being nice" or "being humble" or "treating teachers equally" to avoid conflict and thus achieve control.

The superintendent informed one intern who had finished her internship and had applied for the principalship of her building

> that the Board was impressed but didn't have the confidence that I would be able to handle the difficult teachers, and he put his thumb against the table, like that [demonstrating forcefully pushing the thumb down perpendicular to the rest of the hand, thumb first, onto table, as if to squash whatever was under it]. [The male principal who got the job] said, "You want me to get rid of the old wood, hire me."

As another example of "flexing," one intern recalled:

> My principal only comes out [to the morning pledge] when she wants the teachers to shape up. If someone complains that the teachers are taking too long to pick up their students, she appears for a few days and everyone becomes particularly punctual. She stops attending and the teachers eventually slack off and the cycle begins again. It's the Catholic school mentality of my youth – everybody gets it together because Sister is watching. This behavior does not support the teachers' feeling of competency or autonomy. Rather it makes them feel like children. I don't like it but it is [the principal's] style.

Interns observed administrators crafting stressful situations to effect teacher compliance.

> My principal said that the reading scores are too low and that the teachers are too content. So she's trying to shake them up, change the program, change the way they're doing things. As a result, we have a lot of tension right now in my school. She told me, "That's exactly what I want to create – tension." So her way of shakin' it up is to create stress.

Exerting stress might include pressuring the teachers by externalizing the pressure and placing the blame on superordinates: "My principal does his line a lot with the faculty – 'You know what this board is doing to us right now? Do you know what this superintendent is trying to do?' – So everybody feels bad for him." In a more forceful manner, administrators might resort to threats: "My principal said to a teacher, 'If you are uncomfortable with what you're doing and with what I'm doing and how the school is changing, then think about asking to work someplace else."

The strategy of "quid pro quo" enabled administrators to reward loyalists and punish offenders. Administrators played the game with little subtlety but achieved desired results. One intern's principal instructed her: "Go tell that teacher, if he wants HIS JOB in September, he will be at that end-of-year parent-teacher party, and it will be a BAD political and job decision if he is not there." Others employed a kind of "emotional bank account" for deposits and withdrawals of favors. In this sense, administrators arranged with teachers a mutual exchange whereby "one hand washes the other."

> There was an emotional bank account because there was a feeling of what's important to the administrator is important to me and what's important to me is important to the administrator. I can go in and say, "You know what? My baby is really sick right now and I have to run," and I know she's gonna say, "I'll go take your class – go! I'll cover it."
>
> The teacher had been outspoken at the faculty meeting about adopting learning centers. Initially, she said she couldn't do it. Later on in the day, she apologized to the principal, who, at the meeting, publicly said he was writing her up. When she apologized, she said that since he was the principal and this is what he wanted to try that she would be willing to try it. So here she made a deposit in his account because her security was threatened. Somebody during the day had said to her, "You know, they're thinking about switching 5th grade teachers throughout the district, and just because you're in this building doesn't mean you're going to STAY here." I see that happening a lot with people that he has offended – I see them going back to him. It's almost like an abusive relationship like you hear in marriages.

"Being nice," "being humble," and "treating teachers equally" were benevolent administrative techniques designed to mask administrative muscle. All were used to achieve compliance and control. "One thing I was told was, 'It's a very important asset to be a nice person. Teachers aren't very nice people; they're busy being bosses all day in their classroom. You can't be an administrator if you're not really a nice person to someone who had a bad day.'" It's as if the administrator has to take on the role of parent vis-a-vis the teacher who, like a child, has had a bad day. Administrators can control outcomes and thereby mitigate teachers' tendency to control administrators or to demonstrate lack of emotional control by "being nice" to the teacher.

And by treating teachers in an equitable manner, one can avoid conflict by precluding the appearance of favoritism.

> My principal told me, "People say that I'm a cold fish, but it's so important to be equal to everyone. I don't want to be accused of being the kind of principal that plays favorites, and since it's not within me to gush over everyone, I prefer to keep an even keel."
>
> I was sending little notes, and my principal said, "DON'T SINGLE ANYBODY OUT. Don't ever single anybody out because you like what they're doing."

Assumption: Teachers Are Powerless

The interns were consistently struck by the assumptive message that "teachers are powerless". Teachers conveyed this belief directly and indirectly in displays of apathy or anger over their lack of empowerment. Clearly, if "administrators have the power," then surely teachers as subordinates do not. When administrators acted with unilateral power, teachers observed that feelings were not considered.

> We hadn't done anything with our bulletin boards in the last two years because we don't have a contract. The new principal sent out a memo that she expects them to be nice before parent-teacher conferences. All of a sudden, we hear this RIPPING in the hallway, and all of the custodians are up on ladders taking down everybody's bulletin boards. Nobody tried to save borders, posters, anything! We also asked her to announce toward the end of the conferences that they were going to be over. She didn't make the announcement and so a lot of teachers didn't get out because they couldn't just get up and leave.

The "teachers are powerless" belief was deeply entrenched. Teachers were used to hearing, "This what you're doing, and this is how you're doing it. Everybody just run with it." When one of the intern's cooperating administrators moved to a new school, he asked his faculty:

> "What are we doing that we want to continue doing? What are we doing that we want to STOP doing? And what are some of the things that we hope that we can START doing, that we've never done before? OK, I just need to get a sense of where everybody's at, so where do we want to be in five years?" And there is COMPLETE silence in the room. Complete silence. "Where are we going to be in five years?" And he's looking around. "What's our vision five years from now?"

> and one of the teachers says, "What are you doing asking US that question? I've never felt empowered to answer that question."

Believing in their lack of empowerment, teachers were unable to move forward even when invited in to be collaborative. This deep-seated belief contributed to resistant behavior, which is seen in the next strategy.

Strategy: Manipulate and Resist

During their internship experiences, the interns learned to expect teacher apathy and resistance. They interpreted this as a response to teachers' subordinate status. Believing in their powerlessness and lacking the authority of organizational position, teachers sought alternate means of power.

Teachers relied on passive resistance and covert ways to exercise manipulation of their administrators. For example, principals excited about a new program would receive a totally negative response at a faculty meeting. At staff development conference days, teachers as a group would grumble and turn off when what they've done for the last several years was repeated.

One intern relayed a lengthy story about a scheduling dispute at her school. In order to accommodate a student orientation program, the scheduling change would have resulted in a shorter lunch period with opportunity for the teachers involved to leave school early the equivalent amount of time. A grade level teacher had led others in resisting the change. Ultimately, the solution the intern created was to move the lunches up 15 minutes, keeping the lunch time the same, but even the school secretary was disappointed in the intern for "caving in" when the teachers resisted the change:

> The school secretary who sent out the memo about it is furious because she said, "Oh, here we go again – these damn teachers, you know, it's like [the principal] caves in to them all the time, and now you're caving in to them."

Especially evident in contract disputes, teacher resistance was often blatant and purposeful.

> They [the teachers] call her 'The Big One' [the new principal] and 'The Little One' [the new assistant principal] in the faculty room, and they just TRASH them! The assistant principal has done NOTHING to piss anybody off, except have the title. We'll have no patience ever again for administrators and really have just lost the faith. It's gotten so bad because the teachers are soured about the contract.

But even without contract problems, the interns observed teacher resistance. "I'm seeing there's a lot of resistance, but it's just blatant. "[intern imitating the teachers] I'm not gonna do this because I DON'T WANT TO, BECAUSE I DON'T LIKE SO-AND-SO [said in a very, very snotty tone]."

The Cyclical Nature of Assumptions and Strategies

As each strategy became an outgrowth of an assumption, the cycle became reinforced. The more that administrators used their power to control teachers, the more teachers resisted and the more that administrators believed their use of power was necessary and appropriate. The more administrators resorted to the use of power to regulate teacher behavior, the more teachers perceived themselves as powerless. In like fashion, the following section on personal relationships, too, illustrates how this cycle of organizational relationships impacts personal relationships that further aggravate divisions.

Personal Relationships

Directly related to the organizational relationships outlined previously, and a direct outgrowth of them, assumptions and strategies governing the teacher-administrator relationship that were derived from those assumptions were apparent to the interns during the course of their internships. These beliefs and rules guided the personal relationships between the two groups – teachers and administrators – who seemed to vie for the interns' loyalty.

Assumption: "They" Can't Be Trusted

Both teachers and administrators believed that the other was not to be trusted and counseled interns that they, too, would be advised not to trust "them."

Don't trust teachers. At times, the messages from administrators about trust were mixed: "He says to me things about the teachers. On the one hand, he'll say, 'The teachers really have a lot to offer,' and on the other hand, he'll go, 'You really can't trust them.'"

It seemed that administrators had developed this assumption based upon past hurts and disappointments. This assumption was so deeply embedded that, in some cases, it took time for the message to emerge to the intern. Early in her internship, one intern had said that her principal seemed to "genuinely trust other professionals." Later on, she could clearly see her principal was sending her a very different message:

> He advises me to be careful. "Don't trust them." And I must always remember that there is a tension necessary between teachers and administrators. He said that he started this job thinking that he and the teachers were going to be a team that

> sat down together to make decisions and provide support for each other, and they would all "sail away on the good ship lollipop," but he learned very quickly that that was impossible because they pulled the rug out from under him every time he tried to bring them on board with any new idea.

Don't trust administrators. The interns would observe that frequently teachers did not trust administrators. "There's no trust. The principal's word is garbage, and no one trusts her, and now when she says something, they're standing there laughing and rolling their eyes, 'She's a joke.'"

The assumption not to trust administrators was derived from teachers observing administrators who conveyed distrust. Some administrators behaved unpredictably and capriciously. As one intern emphasized about her principal: "Administrators like HIM give ALL administrators that lack of trust aura around them. Can't trust them."

Teacher distrust of administrators frequently occurred when the administrator was not respected or was feared – when the teachers saw the administrator as, for example, "a big 'b.s.' artist" or associated with someone whom "everybody hates." Even when the foundation for trust had been built by a previous administrator, there was no guarantee that teachers would not be suspect with a new administration.

Particularly striking for the interns, the message not to trust administrators was, at times, directed at them and came from their colleagues. This was a potent message. After all, the interns were still teachers, weren't they? Apparently not, in the eyes of their colleagues.

> There's the definite, you know, "You're-going-to-the-other-side" kind of thing, and not that you're going to go and be different, I mean these people know you, they like you, but I still think they think that you're selling out or something, and it's, "You've crossed over now."

When teachers declared to interns, "You've crossed over now," and noted aspects of the interns' behavior that the teachers explained as "the administrator in you," the "don't trust administrators" message was embedded in the "crossing over" observation. Interns felt that some teachers "were bitter to begin with" and "worked" to maintain an adversarial relationship. Some teachers even called interns "traitors" ("Either you're with us or against us; you can't play both sides of the fence"), declaring, "You never were with us anyway; you belong in the district office."

Strategy: Maintain Distance

Without a sense of trust of one another, teachers and administrators adopted a strategy of maintaining distance. As one intern heard during an administrative meeting, "They're the union. You're the administrators; they're the union. The twain shall never meet."

The distancing behaviors of administrators were physical and emotional, including humor that was denigrating of teachers. "This one's an idiot, that one's an idiot," an intern was told. Another heard superintendents and board members at a law conference for various school districts "talking about teachers and making jokes, anti-teacher jokes, and the room would crack up laughing." The same thing occurred at administrators' meetings in the school district, or when the intern was just in earshot of semi-private male administrators' conversations, overhearing denigrating and sexually suggestive remarks about female teachers. Physical distancing was also evident.

> My administrator, 99% of the time, his office door is locked. If you DO happen to get in, you're welcomed by a kindergarten teacher who he brought with him from the city, almost as a guard, like, "Can I help you?" And he's sitting back at his desk. . . . teachers SEE this and they're like, "Well, what do I have to do to get in his office? What do I have to do to get PAPER? What do I have to do to, this, that, and the other?!"

At the same time, teachers did not want administrators in their faces. About one intern, the teachers literally complained, "She's in our faces!" All the intern recalled having done was "approaching pairs of teachers who were talking in the hall and either joining in their conversation or standing there waiting to speak to the one I needed, thus 'eavesdropping.'"

Delivered by both administrators and teachers, the distance rule could be as simple as defining with whom one eats lunch.

> My principal did say to me, "Oh, eat lunch with your friends now – your days are numbered in that room, you know." It was a promise, it was a GOOD thing, but I'm thinking, "Now I can't eat with my friends? I don't want it to end."
>
> I had one teacher come over to me, and say, "Gee, I'm sorry we can't have lunch, I'd really like to, but you know we can't." And then I'll have ANOTHER teacher come, it's really weird! [Why can't you have lunch with them?] Well, I said that, I said, "Why can't we have lunch?" and she said, "Because I have enough trouble with my colleagues as it is, it would only make more trouble for me."

Especially when the message to maintain distance was delivered to the interns by friends, it became more startling and puzzling. The friend of one of the interns had told her, "You're not having fun with this internship at all, with this whole thing." The intern responded, "I'm not having fun in the place that I've been put. I've been segregated." The "friend" replied, "Well, that's what happens." The intern said, "I don't understand *why* it happens, 'cause it's still *me*, it's still *me*!"

Distancing as a strategy due to distrust, taken to an extreme, became hate in some instances. While one might sacrifice being liked as an administrator, maintaining distance with hate as an element made one stronger and "in control." As one intern recalled,

> I have had some interesting conversations with my principal. He says, "You know, there's a thing about me," he said, [soft voice, like a secret] "I don't mind when people don't like me." He told me to get ready for people to "hate" me as soon as I became an administrator. He said that people would hate me and that I need to de-sensitize myself in preparation for this hatred. He kept using the word "hate," which I found rather strong. I responded by saying that some people may not always agree with what I may do, but no one would really be able to "hate" me. His response was that the dislike made one stronger, that it helped one to truly be in power and control. . . . [T]hen like a day later, [the assistant principal] wasn't there when we had this discussion, [and she] says, "It's OK to be hated. Hated. It's really OK, and it's something you need to get used to." [The assistant principal said that] straight out. "It's OK to be [hated]," [and] something about, "Well, one thing, you're gonna have to know, people are NOT gonna like you. People are just NOT going to like you." And I said, "People don't like me NOW! What's gonna change?" [laughter]

Not only did "hate" factor in as an extreme distancing strategy for administrators, hating an administrator made fashioning the teacher-administrator boundary that much easier for teachers. As one intern humorously recalled, a teacher broke down and told her, "I really wanted ta hate ya, but you're all right!" suggesting the profound nature of the internal struggle teachers might experience in "separating the person from the title," as another intern noted.

Strategy: Protect Self – Withhold Information and Feelings

Believing that people are not to be trusted leads to secrecy. Withholding information further reinforces the lack of trust and again we see the reinforcing nature of these assumptions and strategies. Assuming that the other side could not be trusted, teachers and administrators employed

another strategy to protect themselves. A kind of "don't ask, don't tell" rule was often the norm in the teacher-administrator relationship for this reason. Typical of the enactment of this strategy was a set of cyclical behaviors, as this intern, clearly caught smack in the middle, noted:

> As an administrative intern, I have become privy to personnel information that I would not ordinarily know. It is kind of awkward to have this knowledge about my peers and yet act as if I do not know confidential matters but when I'm with the teachers they're telling me stuff that you don't tell your administrator.
> As a teacher, I know a lot of information that the administrators do not know. There is a fine line that I walk. [During a period of layoffs] there was some mistrust, people didn't believe the administration, we weren't getting all the communication we would have liked about the layoffs, so there was a lack of trust, because of a lack of communication. . . . [T]here [were many] unanswered questions, and uncertainties, and people just felt that the administrators knew more than they were telling.

Withholding information or the lack of communication perpetuated the lack of trust. From the intern's inside perspective on the administration and her cooperating administrator, she could confirm people's suspicions that information was being withheld:

> I know that he didn't want to create panic. . . . [H]e was doing the best he could, and that there were certain instances where they couldn't talk about everything right out in the open. They weren't sure who was going to be laid off, and they didn't want to have mass hysteria, which happened anyway. So they didn't just come right out and say, "OK, everyone's going to be fired tomorrow." I think they kinda just waited until they had all the facts, so I guess by waiting, longer maybe than the staff would have liked, [the staff] felt that [administration] withheld information. . . . But I kind of sympathized with him, 'cause as I was working with him, I came close to him and he would tell me all of the horrible problems coming down from the State, from the City, cuts in special ed., ... And if I wasn't doing an internship, I might have been a little nasty or felt that there was some mistrust there also. But because of the internship, I had more of an understanding and sympathy with the supervisors.

The internship enabled the interns to see and hear "behind closed doors" and made them privy to information withheld from teachers. Through their observations and through direct

communication, they learned that the administrative norm and strategy was to "create a feeling of secrecy" and abide by the rule in communicating with teachers, "There are so many things that they just can't know."

In addition to withholding information, it was also important to withhold feelings. This control strategy protected the self from hurt and conflict. Interns were caught in the middle of this normative behavior; teachers avoided going to the principal with their complaints and instead came to the interns, who would ask them to intercede with the principal and advocate for them. Administrators also reinforced the "withhold feelings" strategy. After honestly conveying what she felt to a fellow teacher at a meeting, one intern's cooperating administrator delivered her this message:

> You're not who you used to be. You may feel like you're still a teacher, but to them, you're an administrator. The teachers at the meeting KNOW you're friendly with me. You were a colleague to this guy to whom you were inappropriate; maybe not officially, maybe not on your paycheck, but when you say something like that, it's gonna come out way stronger because of your position because everyone knows that you're an intern.

And so the intern reflected and absorbed the norm:

> And so therefore what I said was particularly wrong, like it wasn't a colleague to a colleague just being grumpy, it was an administrator to a [teacher], . . . and I didn't realize I could EVER have that kind of impact on people, and she made me aware that I could. I was worried that I had offended this guy, and SHE was worried that I, somewhat of an administrator, even though unofficially, [would] therefore have to watch what I say [chuckles] because I'm gonna create a rift. . . .

The Cyclical Nature of Assumptions and Strategies

Once again, as each strategy became an outgrowth of an assumption, the cycle became reinforced. The lack of trust led both groups to distance themselves. The more they distanced themselves from one another, the less they trusted one another. The distancing behaviors also contributed to the adoption of the second strategy, protecting self by withholding information and feelings. Taken as a whole, the lack of trust evidently dominant in the teacher-administrator relationship along the personal dimension reinforced the organizational dimension. That relationship between teachers and administrators promoted administrator superordinancy and teacher subordinancy, and once again, reinforced the assumptions of the personal relationship.

Discussion

The findings of this study show that teachers and administrators convey messages that clearly define and differentiate the administrative role from that of teachers. Through this process, interns learn the expectations regarding their role and the rules governing their role behavior. These role behaviors create conflict, misunderstanding, frustration, and hard feelings and directly preserve and reinforce the gap between teachers and administrators. These socialization messages convey a perspective of leadership that is quite traditional in its emphasis on hierarchy and control and antithetical to more collaborative and collegial forms of governance in schools. While there were variations in the quality of the relationship between administrators and teachers, in general, this pattern was evident in each situation. What accounts for the pervasiveness of this pattern?

If you accept the notion of the principal as cultural leader, one could define the problem as one of leadership: whether because of inadequate educational preparation or personal style, administrators lack the appropriate knowledge, skills, values, or vision to enact behaviors that are different or more effective. Organizational theory, however, suggests that the problem is more complex and that this pattern of relationships is deeply embedded in school culture and rooted in the organizational and environmental characteristics of schools.

The Influence of School Structure on Teachers and Administrators

According to Ogawa, Crowson, & Goldring (1999), two key dilemmas confronting educational organizations are those of hierarchy and professionalism. Defined as a deep, abiding, and irresolvable dichotomy, these dilemmas reflect the "conflict between the professional's need for autonomy and the organization's need for compliance with formal structures" (p. 283) and the related tension between the pressures toward centralization and decentralization. These and other organizational dilemmas experienced in schools, they argue, "have their roots in the earliest conceptions of organizations as formal, rational, and hierarchically-closed systems" (p. 290). Despite what some view as the inappropriateness of this type of organizational structure for education and continuing efforts to develop new organizational structures, schools remain bureaucratic.

While there are different forms of bureaucracy, schools in many ways resemble a machine bureaucracy. According to Mintzberg (1993), this form of bureaucracy is "the structure closest to the one Max Weber first described, with standardized responsibilities, qualifications, communication channels, and work rules, as well as a clearly defined hierarchy of authority. . . .

the Machine Bureaucracy is a structure with an obsession – namely, control. A control mentality pervades it from top to bottom" (p. 163-167).

Roles are clearly differentiated and those roles are inherently unequal reflecting differences in expertise and concentrating decision making authority and control in the higher echelons. Bureaucratic organizations design jobs to "separate the performance of the work from the administration of it" (Mintzberg, 1993, p. 28) and develop mechanisms to regulate the behavior of the person doing the work. The "boss-worker" relationship seen in the administrator-teacher relationship fits into this model, one in which " [t]he principles of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super- and subordinate in which there is a supervision of lower offices by the higher ones" (Mintzberg, 1993, p. 35).

This rigid division of labor contributes to perceptions of inequality and facilitates hierarchical control. As Ingersoll (1993) explained,

> The division of labor subdivides organizational decision making and tasks into a series of steps. . . . Different steps of differing importance are delegated to different employee and role groups within an organization. The result is a hierarchical structure of circumscribed roles. Hence, the division of labor is, at heart, a division of power – it is fundamentally hierarchical. By definition, it limits the areas in which members have responsibility and authority and is thus a potential means of both organizational coordination and control. (p. 95)

This basic structural characteristic is itself a form of control, but, in a bureaucracy "obsessed with control," there are other forms as well. Beyond the obvious forms of control in schools – namely, direct, including "rules, regulations, supervision, and sanctions" (Ingersoll, 1993, p. 96) and bureaucratic, meaning "the hierarchy of standardized, specialized, and formalized roles" (p. 98) – there are indirect, or "unobtrusive" forms of control.

> Organization members' thought and behavior are controlled . . . by organizational vocabularies and proper communication channels that limit information, set up expectations, provide foci and curtail the search for alternatives. In sum, these patterns become naturalized and serve to invisibly coordinate ostensibly decoupled activities and consequently, the hierarchical roles of teacher, administrator, and student become taken-for-granted institutions. . . . (Ingersoll, 1993, pp. 103-104)

All of these factors contribute to the development and endurance of the assumptive worlds in school organizations.

Through an extensive and intensive socialization process beginning as students in schools and intensifying as individuals enter the workplace, teachers and administrators deeply internalize their prescribed roles and adopt the corresponding assumptions. Because these patterns are so deeply engrained, they are difficult to identify, let alone change. Administrators have formal authority in the organization; teachers do not. Everyone knows this. Persons of lower rank, whether students or teachers, tend to accept their status in a kind of grudging compliance. Persons of higher rank happily accept the power of their formal authority. Teachers don the mantle of "teacher"; they are pawns in the organization. Administrators don the mantle of "administrator"; they are in charge in the organization. So in terms of occupational and organizational socialization, people enter into their designated roles. In these roles, they behave according to normative, generalized perceptions of how people in those roles function.

For teachers and administrators, role differentiation corresponded to differences in power and authority: administrators had it, teachers didn't. Accepting the inherent inequality of these roles, teachers and administrators made assumptions about role behaviors. Believing teachers to be the "workers" locked into fixed, static roles, administrators viewed teachers as apathetic and/or resistant, and needing to be controlled. Believing administrators to be the "bosses" also locked into fixed, static roles, teachers viewed administrators as directive and controlling. Teachers assumed that administrators would exercise the authority of their office to provide them with tangible and intangible resources; administrators assumed that teachers would be compliant subordinates. Teachers assumed that administrators would exercise their power in unilateral and arbitrary ways; administrators assumed that teachers would resist directives. These assumptions were the by-products of the organizational structure. They permeated the socialization messages that the participants received and generated unwritten rules that serve to reinforce the gap between teachers and administrators.

These unwritten, embedded rules established strict relationship guidelines that precluded collegial, collaborative behavior. They reinforced a dysfunctional relationship in which each side vied for power and control. Granted formal authority in the organization, administrators sought to exercise their authority in a unilateral, directive way to control teachers. When administrators were confronted with teacher resistance or apathy, they resorted to a variety of strategies (coercion; manipulation; rewards; threats) intended to achieve compliance. Teachers, who had no formal

authority in the organization other than in their classrooms with their students, sought informal ways to exercise power and to control administrators. Both sides were motivated by the perceived need to control uncertainty in order to survive within the organization.

The rules that emerged in this study parallel Model I behavior. Based on extensive research in organizations in the United States and other countries, Argyris and Schon (1974) identified a common pattern of behavior that they attributed to an internal set of rules. Described as Model I, this meta-theory-in-use, they maintain, is a pervasive part of our society and shapes behavior in almost every domain of our personal and organizational lives. Model I includes four key beliefs, or governing values, reflecting purpose and intent. The first two values deal with achieving your intended purpose, striving to win and avoiding losses. The other two deal with emotions and rationality.

The emphasis on personal determination is often apparent in an effort to exercise unilateral control, often by excluding others from decision-making and ensuring compliance through coercive strategies. The decision-making process is primarily an internal dialogue based on assumptions about other people, their intentions, their feelings, and their likely behavior. To protect this need for unilateral control, assumptions are not shared or tested; options are not explored. As Argyris explained, "Model I tells individuals to craft their positions, evaluations, and attributions in ways that inhibit inquiries into them and tests of them with others' logic" (p. 52, 1993). By retaining control and withholding information, it seems more possible to protect and further a personal agenda while avoiding challenges or distractions.

To act in a "rational" manner is equated with the suppression of emotion. To avoid emotional reactions, individuals adopt protective strategies. They avoid recognizing or communicating information that would create conflict or "hurt" others. By withholding information, particularly critical information, and by refusing to recognize problems either denying their presence or developing explanatory rationales, the intended effect is to protect self and others and maintain an appearance of calm.

These action strategies become evident in certain communication patterns. To maintain control, we rely on directive or prescriptions. To insure compliance with goals, we rely on manipulation, persuasion, coercion, rewards, and rationalization (it's the right thing to do). To avoid conflict, we assure others that everything is all right, we avoid communicating critical information, and we don't talk about problems. These Model I

strategies have a predictable effect on organizational behavior. Confronted with these techniques, people withdraw from dialogue and become wary of others whose language fails to hide ulterior motives. In response to these patterns, people become defensive and manipulative and the organization's creativity and problem-solving capability suffers as people avoid direct communication.

This study illustrated the use of Model I strategies in the school setting and demonstrated its negative effects on the quality of the relationship between administrators and teachers. Assumptions regarding role behavior were rooted in traditional conceptions of bureaucracy. Administrators and teachers internalized these assumptions and acted accordingly. These behaviors in turn generated the responses that they had anticipated and reinforced their prior assumptions. Argyris (1990) explained this cycle as "a ladder of inference" (p. 88). As one climbs this ladder, observable data get interpreted through meaning making, absent the testing of assumptions. The meaning making leads to theories-in-use based upon the inferred meaning, which is often fallacious. Enacting rule behavior created a vicious circle in which teacher behavior confirmed administrators' preconceived expectations of teacher behavior. That perception influenced administrator behavior. In like fashion, administrator behavior aligned with teachers' assumptions. That perception influenced teacher behavior, completing the cycle. These Model I behaviors, then, are deeply embedded in bureaucratic culture; and they serve to maintain this culture, marked by deep hierarchical divisions.

If the quality of the relationship between administrators and teachers is grounded in the organizational structure of the school, then structural changes might be in order. Bureaucracy is not the only organizational form. Organic structures, for example, are characterized by the absence of standardization. In contrast to bureaucracies, they utilize mutual adjustment, allocate authority and responsibility relative to task expertise, and rely on widespread communication to share information and advice rather than to disseminate instructions and decisions (Burns & Stalker, 1961). But, theory tells us that organizational structures are also responsive to environmental pressures and, just as organizational behavior in schools is related to structural characteristics, the bureaucratic structure of schools is itself a predictable response to environmental pressures and demands.

The Influence of the External Environment on Teachers and Administrators

The history of public school education in the United States reveals a long-standing debate about who is in charge:

> American education grew up from the community outward. From Colonial times onward, local citizens built the schools, raised the money, hired the teachers, and chose which books to use. They also elected local leaders to oversee the job. The process was often fractious, and more players have entered the fray in the 20th century. The voices of elected board members and their constituents have been joined by a discordant chorus: a new breed of education professionals, the courts, the federal and state governments, teachers' unions, and advocates for a host of other competing groups and interests. Meanwhile, new legislation and rules have spawned bureaucracies and moved decisions further from local communities. The result is what the historian David B. Tyack calls "fragmented centralization" (*Education Week*, 17 November 1999, p. 1).

As these various constituencies seek to exercise control, schools have no choice but to respond to these social pressures. These external pressures drive organizations to centralize their structure; and, the greater the external control, the more centralized and formalized its structure (Mintzberg, 1993). From this perspective, it is not difficult to understand the tendency for schools to retain bureaucratic procedures.

Comparative studies of organizations have found that they cope most easily with environments likely to attack their practices if their structure is centralized and hierarchical, even though this structure does not facilitate teaching and learning:

> [T]he most pressing instrumental goals of the school, those of coping with a hostile environment of students or of parents (or other influential community members), suggest a social structure and a technological style diametrically opposed to that most suitable for furthering educational goals. . . . Typical public school structure reflects these contradictory pressures. . . . Most [schools] are formally hierarchical bureaucracies, with the teachers directly responsible to a principal who is in turn responsible and accountable to superiors in the school district administration. The structure of the school is thus ambivalent. (Metz, 1990, p. 185)

If the goal of the external environment is control and stability, the internal school environment will be influenced toward the same goal. As Apple (1991) noted, the agendas promulgated by "a powerful conservative alliance" (p. 281) and the growing encroachment on

schools of "the centralization of authority and control" by the federal and state governments ultimately contribute to the "deskilling" of teachers (p. 282):

> In the economic workplace, this process has also ultimately reduced the power of employees to have any significant say in the goals and procedures of the institutions in which they work. [This deskilling] run[s] directly counter to what we are beginning to know about what leads to effective curricula and teaching in schools. . . . [These effects include] a loss of commitment and respect, bitter battles over working conditions, a lowering of quality, and a loss of skill and imagination. (p. 282)

In sum, a combination of forces serves to reinforce and maintain the gulf between teachers and administrators. The organizational structure of schools establishes roles for teachers and administrators that are distinct and marked by hierarchical divisions. In the context of these superior-subordinate relationships, both adopt strategies intended to achieve control. Administrators, with formal authority, rely on bureaucratic means to control teacher behavior; teachers, lacking formal authority, engage in a struggle for power. Based on their assumptions about the role behavior in a bureaucratic system, both adopt communication strategies that reaffirm pre-conceptions. In the climate of mistrust that develops, neither personal nor organizational needs are addressed, yet these basic understandings about organizational behavior are an integral part of the socialization process that interns experience as they prepare to cross over. The problem is complicated further given the "public" nature of schools and continued demands for accountability that ensue from this complex relationship.

Given this definition of the problem, what can be done? Is it possible to improve the adversarial relationships between administrators and teachers?

Implications

As noted earlier, the concept of dilemma seems very appropriate to this situation. Although the competing tensions between centralization and decentralization and between autonomy and compliance may be irresolvable, as Ogawa et. al. (1999) indicate, "school reform is still a matter of active choosing" (p. 291). While difficult, it is possible to make changes designed to address and redress inequities and inefficiencies. While it may not be possible to eliminate external and internal pressures toward centralization and shed all vestiges of bureaucracy, it is

possible to move along the continuum from machine bureaucracy toward more professional and organic organizational models.

It is more possible to do this with a more complex understanding of the problem. After hearing the findings of this study, a teacher commented to the effect that "everyone knows that." What this study did, however, was to articulate what was known only at a tacit level and to illustrate the process by which this knowledge is transmitted. Specifically, it documented the presence and impact of Model I assumptions and behavioral strategies by subordinates as well as superiors and the negative effects of that behavior. The study also augmented the importance of using a dialectical perspective of socialization:

> [T]he argument is made that while people are constrained by social structural limitations, they at the same time play an active part in shaping their identities, often acting in ways that contradict the norms and values that pervade a social setting. . . . Hence, socialization is a dynamic process involving pressure to change from various directions as individuals assume roles and learn and attempt to influence the role expectations within a given social setting. (Templin & Schempp, 1989, p. 3)

By juxtaposing the process by which teachers learn to become administrators and the relationship between teachers and administrators, this study revealed the nexus between socialization and organizational structure and culture, and highlighted the assumption making that is embedded in the structure and culture and emerges in the socialization process. The bureaucratic hierarchy in schools (administrators with formal authority, teachers without) and the concomitant organizational subcultures of administrators and teachers play major roles influencing the process and content of the informal socialization of administrative candidates. From the perspective of teachers and administrators, schools function like machine bureaucracies; and both adopt appropriate roles. Deeply embedded assumptions about teachers, administrators, and their relationship with one another influence the organizational behavior of teachers and administrators, define the teacher-administrator relationship, and color the socialization of those "crossing over" from "teacher" to "administrator."

As the nature of the problem emerges more clearly, the solutions become more evident.

Since this problem seems embedded in the organizational structure of schools, one response is to develop alternate structures that would change the nature of the hierarchical relationship between teachers and administrators. Writing about ways to develop teachers into collegial leaders, Carr (1997) declared,

> Teachers have been traditionally taught not to question, to simply follow rules and regulations – a disposition that does not encourage interaction or connections. Moreover, the typical school organization reflects an industrial model, which makes it easy to do the least that is expected . . . and to blame the resulting classroom atmosphere on state requirements, administrative rules, or "the kinds of students we have these days." Such passive environments support the view of teaching as a job –a view that squanders teachers' potential and limits their satisfaction in the classroom. We need, instead, to cultivate school environments that reflect the conception of teaching as a profession, environments that encourage teachers to work with administrators as collegial leaders. (p. 240)

While it may not be possible to eliminate bureaucracy from schools, it may be possible to modify structure. Alternate ways to divide labor, distribute authority, and facilitate communication might help to flatten the hierarchy and reduce the inherent inequalities in power and authority that currently characterize the teaching and administrative roles.

The study also has implications for professional development of administrators. The patterns that are described here are pervasive but not exclusive. The quality of the relationships between teachers and administrators, while marked by divisions and defensiveness, varied along a continuum. Some administrators were more effective in establishing positive relationships than others; and in some settings, teachers, while retaining a basic posture of defensiveness, were less antagonistic toward their superiors. Another important finding was that teachers and administrators play active roles in the socialization process, sharing complicity. This suggests the importance of carefully selecting both the supervisor and the internship setting. To the extent possible, administrative preparation programs should attempt to place students in situations where teacher and administrator relationships are positive and administrators have developed skills that enable them to deal more effectively with these inherent role divisions. Both administrators and teachers play key roles in the interns' socialization experience. Supervisors and settings should be selected because they are exemplary role models. Negative role models must be eschewed.

Internship programs could also incorporate an orientation program for supervisors, focusing on the complexity of the socialization process and enabling them to be more effective mentors.

Illustrating the important role that assumptions play in shaping behavior, the study reiterates the importance of examining assumptions as part of preparation programs. Because these assumptions are so deeply embedded in the culture of schools, they are difficult to identify or change. If we accept the value of collaborative action on the part of the various members of the school team, it is necessary for prospective administrators to identify the role-related assumptions that may interfere with their ability to achieve collaboration and collegiality. Administrators should examine their beliefs about organizational leadership in light of research that demonstrates the consequences of different organizational control strategies. Teachers, too, need to recognize their own practice and underlying assumptions. The organizational structure does not facilitate the distribution of authority, but both teachers and administrators can determine how this dilemma of hierarchy is resolved in the particular setting.

Learning takes place not only through direct observation and experience but also through vicarious learning. There are multiple examples in the literature describing leaders who are able to transform organizations into democratic, participative, learning organizations. As part of pre-service and in-service professional development programs, administrators, both novice and veteran, need to learn that there are different approaches to organizational leadership other than bureaucratic and transactional ones – transformational as well as organic (Blase & Anderson, 1995; Blase & Kirby, 1992; Leithwood, 1992; Lieberman & Miller, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1993). Educators and researchers need to pay more attention not only to the leadership vision but also to the strategies that these successful administrators have adopted. Developing an awareness of what is possible as well as the constraints facing administrators as they attempt to change bureaucratic cultures should facilitate their efforts.

It is also important for prospective administrators to develop strategies that will enable them to establish more positive relationships with their colleagues. Just as Model I communication strategies are associated with negative outcomes, Model II strategies that involve the use of descriptive rather than prescriptive language, openly sharing information, and testing of assumptions support organizational and personal learning. In contrast with Model I, these strategies establish trust and facilitate problem-solving communication, creativity, and innovation. Through their participation in this research project, the interns developed a deeper understanding of the problems confronting administrators as they try to implement collaborative leadership

strategies. They had also learned alternative strategies for addressing and resolving conflict in an organizational setting. Whether this insight and preparation will affect their leadership over time is a question for further research, but clearly their understanding is markedly different as a result of this analysis.

The professional development implications extend beyond the boundaries of administrative preparation, however. Teachers play an important role in the organizational life of schools. Even more so than administrators, they enter schools with little or no preparation regarding the nature of those roles and the potential impact of the organization on them and vice versa. If teachers are to be viewed as professionals and to assume leadership responsibility, they need preparation for these organizational dimensions of their roles. Teacher preparation programs focus exclusively on the technical dimensions of the role. Learning to teach is a major task and it may not be possible to introduce this focus into initial preparation programs; but it certainly should be on the agenda for advanced graduate education and an important component of in-service programs offered by districts or teacher centers. Limiting studies of organizational behavior and leadership solely to administrative candidates deepens the role divisions and maintains inequity.

Leadership, according to Ogawa & Bossert (1995), is an organizational quality rather than an individual phenomenon. Preparing teachers to assume roles as leaders would enrich schools, lower the boundaries dividing roles, enhance role flexibility, and make role transitioning more uneventful and less fraught with upheaval in organizational identity. As Henrik Ibsen once said, "A community is like a ship; everyone ought to be prepared to take the helm." To support teacher leadership, it is important to formally recognize the leadership dimensions of the role and prepare teachers for these roles. Enabling teachers to examine their own assumptions and develop more effective organizational strategies might also facilitate efforts to move away from rigid bureaucratic models to more organic ones, characterized by open communication, shared responsibility, and distribution of authority relative to expertise.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the moral socialization that teachers in preservice administration preparation programs experience in the internship and to identify the messages that they receive about the relationship between teachers and administrators. The study determined that teachers and administrators were complicit in communicating expectations to interns about role divisions and the rules regulating behavior in the administrative role. These messages informed interns that administrators were expected to exercise control and to rely on traditional bureaucratic

strategies to do so. The use of these strategies, they learned, was necessary because teachers were subordinates, and, as subordinates, were passive, apathetic, and resistant to authority. The administrators also learned that administrators and teachers used certain strategies in their dealings with one another. Neither group trusted the other and their communication was guarded. They assumed that their relationship was adversarial and acted accordingly. Their behaviors then generated the anticipated response, confirming expectations and reinforcing the assumptions. This vicious cycle served to maintain divisions between teachers and administrators. While the gap between teachers and administrators is clearly documented in the literature and in the experience of practitioners, this study illustrated the way that the socialization process contributes to its development and maintenance.

This pattern of behavior is deeply embedded in the culture of schools as bureaucratic organizations, with consequent implications for reform efforts to move toward more collegial forms of governance. Structure and behavior are intertwined, and changes in either require an examination of underlying assumptions as well as intentional intervention to modify assumptions and behavior. The study also suggests that professional development efforts need to address the needs of teachers as well as administrators. Since both are key players in shaping organizational culture, it is important that both have a deep understanding of that culture, its dynamics, its antecedents and its consequences.

References

Anderson, G. L. (1991). Cognitive politics of principals and teachers: Ideological control in an elementary school. In J. Blase (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*, pp. 120-138. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Apple, M. W. (1991, May). Conservative agendas and progressive possibilities: Understanding the wider politics of curriculum and teaching. *Education and Urban Society, 23* (3), pp. 279-291.

Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory into practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micropolitics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization.* London: Methuen.

Begley, P. T., & Campbell-Evans, G. (1992, December). Socializing experiences of aspiring principals. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 38* (4), 285-299.

Blase, J., & Anderson, G. L. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Blase, J. & Kirby, P. C. (1992). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Briggs-Carter, J. M. (1991). Socialization of prospective principals as instructional leaders in the era of "school reform": Anticipatory deskilling and reskilling in the process of becoming a principal. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 442)

Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Carr, D. A. (1997, May/June). Collegial leaders: Teachers who want more than just a job. *The Clearing House, 70* (5), 240-242.

Cordiero, P. A., & Smith-Sloan, E. (1995, April). *Apprenticeships for administrative interns: Learning to talk like a principal.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33* (1), 22-43.

Crow, G. M., & Pounders, M. L. (1996, April). *The administrative internship: "Learning the ropes" of an occupational culture.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Dewar, A. M. (1989). Recruitment in physical education teaching: Toward a critical approach. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*, pp. 39-58. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press, Inc.

Edson, S. K. (1987, Winter). Voices from the present: Tracking the female administrative aspirant. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7* (4), 261-277.

Greenfield, W. D. (1975, April). *Organizational socialization and the preparation of educational administrators.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Greenfield, W. D. (1985, April). *Being and becoming a principal: Responses to work contexts and socialization processes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Gronn, P. C. (1988). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. In A. Westoby, *Culture and power in educational organizations*, pp. 289-314. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* London: Routledge.

Hargreaves, A. (1990). Teachers' work and the politics of time and space. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 3* (4), 303-320.

Hart, A. W. (1991, Winter). Leader succession and socialization: A synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 61* (4), 451-474.

Ingersoll, R. M. (1993). Loosely coupled organizations revisited. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 11* (pp. 81-112). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kammeraad-Campbell, S. (1991). *Teacher: Dennis Littky's fight for a better school.* New York: Penguin Books.

Larson, C. L. (1992). *Is the land of Oz an alien nation?: A story of school community conflict.* Unpublished conference draft.

Lawson, H. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2* (3), 3-16.

Leithwood, K. (1992, February). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49* (5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1994). The socialization of school-leaders. In *Developing expert leadership for future schools* (pp. 148-165). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Lessons of a century: Who's in charge? (1999, November 17). *Education Week 19* (12), pp. 1, 25-44.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1999). *Teachers: Transforming their world and their work.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, C. (1991). The chasm between administrator and teacher cultures: A micropolitical puzzle. In J. Blase (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*, pp. 139-160. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Marshall, C. (1992). *The assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1990, April). *The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

McNeil, L. M. (1988). *Contradictions of control.* London: Routledge.

Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Metz, M. H. (1990). Organizational tensions and authority in public schools. In K. J. Dougherty & F. M. Hammack (Eds.), *Education and society: A reader*, pp. 181-192. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis. Second edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mintzberg, H. (1993). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Muse, I. D., Thomas, G. J., & Wasden, F. D. (1992, July). Potential problems (and solutions) of mentoring in the preparation of school administrators. *Journal of School Leadership, 2* (3), 310-319.

Ogawa, R. & Bossert, S. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31,* 224-243.

Ogawa, R.T., Crowson, R.L., & Goldring, E.B. (1999). Enduring dilemmas of school organization. In Murphy, J. & Louis, K.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 277-295). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Restine, N. L. (1990, November). *The preparation of aspiring educational administrators: Transition and transformation in the internship.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1993, April). *Organizations or communities? Changing the metaphor changes the theory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Siskin, L. S. (1995, April). *The "hermaphroditic" roles of department chairs: Where teaching and leadership converge.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Templin, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (1989). Socialization into physical education: Its heritage and hope. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*, pp. 1-11. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press, Inc.

Valverde, L. A. (1974). *Succession socialization: Its influence on school administrative candidates and its implication to the exclusion of minorities from administration* (National Institute of Education Project No. 3-0813). Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (1990, October). *The professional socialization of graduate students in educational administration.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

White, E., & Crow, G. M. (1993, April). *Rites of passage: The changing role perceptions of interns in their preparation for principalships.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.